

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

53

24th June, 1960COCOM Document No. 3715.29/4COORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONON A NETHERLANDS MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE
EXPORT OF TELEVISION MEASURING AND SERVICING EQUIPMENTTO THE SINO-SOVIET BLOCITEM 152920th and 23rd June, 1960

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

Reference: COCOM Document 3715.29/3.

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the Netherlands Memorandum concerning the export to the Sino-Soviet Bloc of television measuring and servicing equipment covered by the present definition of Item 1529 but having no strategic significance. At the close of their Memorandum the Netherlands Delegation had suggested two alternative procedures by which such equipment might be exported freely. The Chairman invited Delegates to express their authorities' views in this connexion.
2. The GERMAN Delegate stated that, after study of the Netherlands Delegation's proposal, the German authorities considered that a definition of a general nature should be drawn up in order to free such equipment from embargo on condition that certain specifications were met. Pending the drafting of a definition along these lines, it seemed difficult to free a given type of equipment as long as similar models manufactured by other factories remained under embargo. Such a solution would be contrary to the principle of uniformity. In conclusion, the Delegate stated that the German authorities would give sympathetic consideration to any redefinition proposal of a general nature.
3. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that his authorities saw no objection to the Netherlands proposal and agreed to either a Licensing Guide or an Interpretative Note. Like the German authorities, and for the same reasons, they felt, however, that the matter should be considered in general terms. The United Kingdom authorities were not at this stage aware of the exact terms of the Licensing Guide or Interpretative Note. This would have to be considered at a later date.
4. The FRENCH Delegate said that his authorities had no objection to the Netherlands proposal. He pointed out, with regard to the Wobulator characteristic listed as (b), that equipment using the frequency range from 5 to 220 Mc/s or from 440 - 500 Mc/s was not under embargo, since the definition covered instruments designed for use at frequencies in excess of 500 Mc/s. He voiced the opinion of French experts that Item 1533 applied rather than Item 1529.
5. The UNITED STATES Delegate stated that with regard to the Netherlands proposal recorded in COCOM Document 3715.29/3, the United States authorities did not believe that it would be administratively feasible either to add an Interpretative Note to Item 1529 or to establish a Licensing Guide to accomplish this objective. While the Service Wobulator type No. GM 2877

was used in commercial TV, it was also used in wide band amplifiers which had direct military applications. Similarly, the Pattern Generator type No. GM 2892 was used primarily in civilian TV and similar applications, but most instruments of this category were general purpose types which had both civilian and military uses. Since strategic and non-strategic instruments of these types could be distinguished only on the basis of end-use, the United States authorities saw no practical way to exclude civilian instruments from embargo coverage. The United States authorities believed that present procedures were adequate to handle exceptions requests for this type of equipment and recommended against making any change in either the exceptions procedure or the definition of Item 1529.

6. The ITALIAN Delegate stated that his authorities had not yet taken a decision on this matter. He recalled that, as set out in COCOM Document 3715.29/1, his Delegation had been in favour of a compromise arrangement whereby equipment operating at frequencies between 500 Mc/s and 1,000 Mc/s should be exportable in reasonable quantities when there was no doubt that it constituted television equipment and on condition that the Committee be informed immediately. On the specific question raised by the Netherlands Delegation, he would endeavour to obtain final instructions without delay.

7. The FRENCH Delegate questioned the accuracy of the statement just made by the United States Delegate to the effect that the Service Wobbulator, type No. GM 2877, was used in wide band amplifiers having direct military applications. He pointed out that, according to specification (d), the frequency calibration was effected by means of an incorporated marker oscillator with an error smaller than 1%: in the view of French experts, for equipment which was to be put to military use, the margin of error would need to be 1 in 100,000. For the rapid scanning of a frequency band by means of a Wobbulator or an analyser, it was necessary to record very precisely the frequency of transmission occurring in the band and to make some counter-measure operation such as jamming the equipment in as short a time as possible. In order to jam a telegraph transmitter at a frequency of 200 Mc/s, the frequency must be given with an accuracy of between 2 and 3 Kc/s. If the Service Wobbulator were employed for the use mentioned above, at the frequency of 200 Mc/s, its accuracy (1%) would only be sufficient to obtain an approximation of 2 megacycles. In the case of equipment for military use, a computer - not mentioned in the Netherlands Memorandum - automatically displayed the frequency and also adjusted the frequency of the jamming transmitter. Referring to the second type of equipment mentioned in the Netherlands Memorandum, i.e. a Pattern Generator, type No. GM 2892, the French Delegate stated that the information given indicated that this instrument was a miniature TV transmitter. It covered only three frequency bands, which were continuously tuned and, since it was certainly of a simple type (self-controlled oscillator) it would not be accepted as a full-scale transmitter in accordance with the international regulations. The frequency drift mentioned, 0.5%, also indicated a very elementary type of equipment. In the view of French experts, this Pattern Generator should be considered as a small experimental transmission equipment, very different from major servicing equipment.

8. The UNITED STATES Delegate undertook to refer these comments to his authorities for consideration.

9. The NETHERLANDS Delegate thanked all Delegations for the views just expressed. He had already transmitted to his authorities the United States Delegation's comments, of which he had had prior knowledge, but so far had received no reaction. He expressed special thanks for the expert comments by the French Delegation, and for the exact and useful information given, which he would transmit to his authorities. He would enquire whether the latter would prefer to have this matter discussed on the 7th July, when it was hoped that the Committee would have the assistance of experts, or whether postponement until the autumn List Review would be considered a more desirable procedure. He would try to obtain his authorities' instructions by the 23rd June.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

COCOM Document No. 3715.29/4

10. The CHAIRMAN, in summing up the discussion, noted that there was some degree of sympathy for the substance of the Netherlands proposal. There was however some doubt, especially on the part of the United States Delegation, as to how the equipment mentioned in the Netherlands Memorandum could be separated from the existing definition, and the German Delegation had invited the Netherlands authorities to submit a proposal for a new definition.

11. The FRENCH Delegate stated that in this matter the Netherlands Delegate was sovereign, but that, should the Netherlands Delegate and his authorities so wish, the French Delegation would be quite prepared to submit a new definition. Otherwise, as the matter was of no immediate concern to the French Delegation, they would be willing to wait until the autumn List Review.

12. The NETHERLANDS Delegate thanked his French colleague and said he felt sure that the Netherlands authorities and experts would be happy if the French Delegation could make a proposal for a new definition.

13. The CHAIRMAN having suggested that a text might be worked out on a bilateral basis, the FRENCH Delegate stated that the competent French experts would be at the Netherlands Delegate's disposal for discussions at whatever time suited him.

14. On the 23rd June the NETHERLANDS Delegate said that his authorities would prefer to have this matter discussed on the 7th July and that a Netherlands expert would attend.

15. The COMMITTEE agreed to place this question on the agenda for July 7th. The FRENCH and GERMAN Delegations stated that they would be assisted by experts on that date and other Delegations said that they too would do their best to obtain expert assistance. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate undertook to inform the Committee on this point at the next meeting.

CONFIDENTIAL